

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-14, 16-18, 20-28, and 33-42 remain pending in the present application as amended. Claims 1-14, 16-18, 20-28, and 33-42 have been rejected. Independent claims 1, 16, 18, and 26 have been amended. No claims have been added or canceled. No new matter has been added.

### **Telephone Conversation With Examiners**

Examiner Torimiro and Supervisory Examiner Pezzuto are thanked for the telephone conversation conducted on May 28, 2008. Proposed claim amendments were discussed. Examiners agreed that proposed claim amendments appear to overcome the rejections based on the cited art.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-6, 8-14, 18, 20-22, 24-28, 33-38, and 40<sup>1</sup> under 35 USC § 103 as being obvious over Sparks II (U.S. Pat. No. 6,352,479) in view of Hull et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2005/0171955). Also, the Examiner has rejected claims 16 and 17 under 35 USC § 103 as being obvious over Kume (U.S. Pat. No. 6,203,433) in view of the Sparks II and Hull references. Additionally, the Examiner has rejected the remaining claims, all of which are dependent, under 35 USC § 103 as being obvious over the Sparks II reference in view of various other references. Applicants respectfully traverse the § 103 rejections insofar as they may be applied to the claims as amended.

The present application is generally directed to online game matchmaking using play style information. Accordingly, if one player / user initiates an online game as a host and other players / users are considering joining the game as guests, a centralized system matches each

---

<sup>1</sup> The Examiner in stating the first Section 103 rejection refers to claims that have been canceled (15, 19, and 29-32) and also omits any reference to claim 40 even though details of the rejection address such claim 40. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection as properly stated is with regard to the claims specified above.

other player to the initiated online game if the system determines based upon a play style and/or personal attribute that the other player is compatible with the host and can be assigned as a guest of such host.

Independent claim 1 recites a method for matching users over a network in an online gaming environment. Upon a user entering into a first online game, at least one response is received from the user with regard to at least one query to the user about the first online game experience following completion of the first online game by the user. Based thereon, a play style parameter of a requesting user is determined based on the at least one response.

Thereafter, the requesting user is connected to a second online game based at least in part on the determined play style parameter. For example, if the play style parameter shows that the user is a serious gamer interested in challenging games, the requesting user is connected to a game with other like-minded serious games, and not to a game with casual players. The connecting is also based at least in part on a collaborative filtering method that aids the requesting user in the selection of the second online game based upon evaluations of the second online game made by other users. For example, if other users have evaluated a particular game to be high-spirited, the user is not connected to such particular game if low-key.

Independent claims 16, 18, and 26 all recite subject matter similar to that of claim 1, albeit in varying forms. Claim 16 recites the subject matter as a computer-readable medium, claim 18 as a system, and claim 26 as a method with differing scope.

As was pointed out in the reply to the previous Office Action, the Sparks II reference is utterly silent with regard to and thus fails to disclose a user being questioned about an online gaming experience, as is recited in all of the independent claims of the present application. In the instant Office Action, the Examiner effectively concedes the point but nevertheless continues by citing the Hull reference with regard to all of the independent claims as disclosing receiving “feedback to at least one query about a first online game experience following completion of the

first online game”. The Examiner cites to paragraph 0041 of the Hull reference in support of the statement.

However, Applicants have reviewed the Hull reference and in particular paragraph 0041 thereof, which discloses a behavior tracker 254 configured to detect and store information regarding a portal subscriber's online actions and profile characteristics. As disclosed, the Hull behavior tracker 254 can detect that a portal subscriber: navigated to one or more particular web sites, spent time playing a particular online game, made particular purchases from particular vendors, participated in a particular chat room, performed particular searches, sent particular messages, etc. based thereon, the Hull tracker can assess the accuracy of information provided by the portal subscriber, gather feedback about the portal subscriber submitted by other portal subscribers, and perform other tracking and evaluation operations.

All of the actions are performed by the Hull tracker in an automated manner, and without the need to query the portal subscriber / user directly. Accordingly, the Hull reference discloses a tracker that automatically collects information from a computing device of a user, and not a service that receives a response from the user with regard to at least one query to the user about the first online game experience following completion of the first online game by the user, as is now recited in the independent claims of the present application. Accordingly, the Hull reference fails to disclose or even suggest such limitation as is recited in the independent claims, and therefore cannot be applied to make obvious such independent claims.

Moreover, both the Sparks II and Hull references are entirely silent regarding the requesting user being connected to a second online game based at least in part on a collaborative filtering method that aids the requesting user in the selection of the second online game based upon evaluations of the second online game made by other users, as is also now recited in the independent claims of the present application. Thus, the Sparks II and Hull references both fail to disclose or suggest this limitation too, and therefore cannot be applied to make obvious the independent claims for this reason too.

**DOCKET NO.:** MSFT-6045/307047.01  
**Application No.:** 10/788,408  
**Office Action Dated:** February 26, 2008

**PATENT**

Accordingly, and for all of the aforementioned reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of the Sparks II and Hull references (claims 1, 18, and 26) or the Kume, Sparks II, and Hull references (claim 16) does not disclose or make obvious the subject matter of independent claims 1, 16, 18, or 26 as amended, or any depending claims depending therefrom, including claims 2-6, 8-14, 17, 20-22, 24, 25, 27, 28, 33-38, and 40. Moreover, inasmuch as such independent claims are unanticipated and have been shown to be non-obvious, then so too must all claims depending therefrom including claims 7, 23, 39, 41, and 42 be unanticipated and non-obvious, at least by their dependencies. As a result, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of § 103 rejections.

**DOCKET NO.:** MSFT-6045/307047.01  
**Application No.:** 10/788,408  
**Office Action Dated:** February 26, 2008

**PATENT**

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing Amendment and Remarks, Applicants respectfully submit the present application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: June 24, 2008

**/Joseph F. Oriti/**  
Joseph F. Oriti  
Registration No. 47,835

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439